1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

2425

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

SUZANNE CAREY,

v.

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C10-5592BHS

PIERCE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT, et. al.,

Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants' motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) (Dkt. 21). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiff's ("Carey") case.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY & FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This matter arises out of Carey's challenge against actions taken by Defendants that, Carey alleges, violated her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights.

On December 9, 2010, Defendants moved to dismiss Carey's claims pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Dkt. 21. Carey did not initially respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss. *See* Dkt. 28. The Court ordered Carey to show cause why this case should not be dismissed, and informed Carey of what would be required within her response and any affidavits attached thereto in order for her

to avoid dismissal. *See id.* (setting out the rules regarding defending against motions to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) or 12(b)(1)).

On January 21, 2011, Carey filed her response to the Court's show cause order. Dkt. 29. Carey attached an affidavit thereto. *Id.*, Attachment 1 ("Carey Affidavit). On January 28, 2011, Defendants replied to Carey's response. Dkt. 30.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Defendants' Motion to Strike

Within their reply, Defendants move the Court to strike certain statements from Carey's response. *See* Dkt. 30 at 3-4 (setting out statements sought to be stricken). The Court grants this motion because the statements that Defendants move to strike are irrelevant, unsupported, and/or are not authenticated. *See* Dkt. 29; *see also* Carey Affidavit.

B. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Rule 12(b)(6)

Defendants move the Court to dismiss Carey's case for failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted under Rule 12(b)(6). Dkt. 21. The Court previously informed Carey that, to defeat such a motion to dismiss, "a plaintiff must set out specific facts in declarations, or authenticated documents, or an amended complaint that contradicts the facts shown in a defendant's documents and shows that there are facts that, if believed, would support a cognizable legal theory." Dkt. 28 at 3. The Court also cautioned Carey that failure to adequately respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss would likely result in dismissal of her case. *Id*.

Carey's response fails to set out facts that, if believed, would state a claim for which relief could be granted. Carey's response to the Court's show cause order contains mostly unsupported irrelevant statements that are largely unintelligible. *See* Dkt. 29. The statements in Carey's briefing that are potentially relevant are insufficient to defeat Defendants' motion and/or have not been adequately supported by affidavit or otherwise.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Therefore, the Court grants Defendants' motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

C. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Rule 12(b)(1)

Because the Court grants Defendants' motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), it declines to reach Defendants' further argument seeking dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1). *See* Dkt. 21 at 16-17.

D. Defendants' Request to Limit Further Pleadings From Carey

At this time, the Court denies Defendants' request for the Court to enter an order limiting Carey from submitting future filings to this Court.

III. ORDER

Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendants' motion to strike is **GRANTED** and Defendants' motion to dismiss this case is **GRANTED** as discussed herein.

DATED this 17th day of February, 2011.

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge